

REMARKS

Claims 4, 6, 8, 10, 14, 16, and 20-22 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Item 4: Allowable Subject Matter

In item 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates claim 8 is allowable. (Action at page 6).

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter

Request That Finality of Current Action Be Withdrawn

Applicants respectfully submit that the current Office Action is incomplete since the Examiner has not responded to all of Applicants' arguments traversing the rejections from the previous Office Action mailed November 30, 2006 that were presented in the previous Amendment filed June 19, 2007 ("previous Amendment").

In the previous Amendment, Applicant traversed the rejection of pending claims 4, 6, 8, 10, 14, 16, and 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Materna et al. (US 4,714,995).

Applicants argued, in part, even assuming *arguendo* a "SEND command" and a "distribution module may continue performing other functions" that are disclosed by Materna respectively teach a "role object as an active role and a "role object as a passive role, as the Examiner asserts in support of the rejection, Materna does not disclose that such an *arguendo* "role object as an active role" is generated "with respect to information processing means that is a data transmission origin," as recited by claim 4, for example.

The Examiner does not address this argument in the current Office Action.

Applicants also argued that Materna does not disclose the *arguendo* "role object as a passive role" is generated "with respect to information processing means that is a data transmission destination," as recited by claim 4, for example.

The Examiner does not address this argument in the current Office Action.

Further, Applicants argued that Materna does not disclose a selection from a plurality of kinds of communication methods including real communication and delayed batch communication and batch communication. Applicants argued that rather, Materna just teaches a singular method.

The Examiner does not address this argument in the current Office Action.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the finality of the current Office Action be

withdrawn and another action issued including a complete response and with the due date accordingly reset.

Traverse of Rejections

In item 3 of the current Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims independent claims 4, 10, 14, and 20 (and dependent claims 6, 16, and 21-22) under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Materna et al. (US 4,714,995). The rejections are traversed.

Applicants submit that each of independent claims 4, 10, 14, and 20 recite features that patentably distinguish over the cited art

Claim 4 recites a data perpetuation object apparatus including "information identification object generating means for generating an information identification object that determines information to be stored in a storage apparatus of each information processing means; collaboration information storage means for storing information on a communication method between the information processing means as collaboration information among the plurality of information processing means; role object generating means that generates a role object as an active role with respect to information processing means that is a data transmission origin, and a role object as a passive role with respect to information processing means that is a data transmission destination; and relating object generating means for referring to the collaboration information of the collaboration information storage means and generating a relating object for transmitting information to be stored in a storage apparatus of each information processing means between the role objects, in accordance with a communication method between the information processing means that is a data transmission origin and the information processing means that is a data transmission destination." Independent claims 10, 14, and 20 have similar recitations.

A. Applicants submit that Materna does not disclose, for example, "generating means for generating an information identification object that determines information to be stored in a storage apparatus of each information processing means (emphasis added)," as recited by claim 4, for example.

The Examiner asserts:

Materna's teaching "The distribution module obtains from dictionary module 64 information specifying which host computers need to receive the updates and a "template" specifying how to reformat. . . data into the schema of the host computer's data base to which it is to be sent. . . distribution module then passes all this information to the appropriate transform module 69. . . reads-on information identification object used in determining information to be stored in

each of the storages of the information processors.
(Emphasis added, Action at page 7, line 6 - page 8, line 2).

Applicants submit that the Examiner's assertions regarding Materna are in error. Applicant respectfully submits that regardless of the interpretation, the Examiner assertions do not lead one of ordinary skill in the art as to Materna teaching such a generating means, that is:

Interpretation I: *Arguendo* assuming a literal reading of the Examiner's assertion that the "distribution module obtains from dictionary module 64 information," itself, reads-on the "information identification object."

Even using Interpretation I, Applicants submit Materna, does not teach generating means for generating the "information identification object," i.e., generating means for generating the distribution module and dictionary module.

Interpretation II: *Arguendo* assuming the Examiner's Response to indicate the "distribution module" teaches a "generating means."

Even using Interpretation II, Applicants submit that Materna does not teach the "distribution module" generating "dictionary module 64 information."

Interpretation III: *Arguendo* assuming the Examiner's Response is intended to indicate the dictionary module teaches the generating means.

Even using Interpretation III, Applicants submit that Materna does not teach the "dictionary module" as generating the "distribution module."

That is, the Examiner's interpretation of Materna is not correct regardless of a reading of the Examiner's interpretation.

B. Claim 4, for example, further recites "collaboration information storage means for storing information on a communication method between the information processing means as collaboration information among the plurality of information processing means."

Applicants submit that even assuming information stored by "dictionary module 64" discussed by Materna teaches information "information on a communication method," as the Examiner asserts in Response to Arguments, Materna does not teach, nor does the Examiner cite the information that teaches "collaboration information" among the plurality of information processing means.

C. Even assuming *arguendo* the "SEND command" and the "distribution module may

continue performing other functions," disclosed by Materna, respectively teach a "role object as an active role and a "role object as a passive role," as recited by claim 4, for example, Applicants submit that nothing in Materna discloses the features recited by claim 4, as a whole.

That is, Materna does not teach that an *arguendo* "role object as an active role" is generated "with respect to information processing means that is a data transmission origin." Materna does not teach an *arguendo* "role object as a passive role" is generated "with respect to information processing means that is a data transmission destination."

By contrast, Materna merely discloses, for example, col. 9, lines 27-33:

Depending on the actual communications protocol employed to communicate over the network 12, each SEND, RECEIVE or AUDIT command may have to be preceded by a CONNECT command to establish communication between the data translator 22 and the update manager 32 of a desired host computer system 10).

That is, Materna merely teaches that the shared data is for example a "dimension of a part."

D. Further, features recited by dependent claims are separately not disclosed by Materna. For example, dependent claim 22 recites a storage "wherein the communication method is selected from a plurality of kinds of communication methods including real communication, delayed batch communication, and batch communication."

The Examiner contends this feature is taught by Materna since:

Materna teaches the communication is selected from, among other things, batch communication (e.g., transmitted as a batch) [see the discussion, beginning at col. 9, line 22].

(Action at page 9).

Applicants submit that the Examiner's interpretation of Materna is in error. Applicants submit that Materna does not teach a selection "from a plurality of kinds of communication methods." Rather, Materna discloses a singular method of transmission by batch.

Summary

Since features recited by independent claims 4, 10, 14, and 20 (and respective dependent claims 6, 16, and 21-22) are not taught by Materna, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 4, 6, 10, 14, 16, and 20-22 allowed.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot, further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding

objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: December 10, 2007

By: Paul W. Bobowec
Paul W. Bobowec
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501